



## **JEFFERSON PARK EXPANSION** **PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #3**

**Thursday, November 17, 2005**  
Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

### **MEETING SUMMARY Draft**

- PAT Members Present:** Mira Latoszek                      Mike Carney  
Monique Cherrier                      Steve Galey  
Stuart McFeely
- PAT Members Absent:** Nancy Spurgeon                      Bruce Bentley  
Shellwyn Badger                      Bert Caoili
- Other attendees:** Randy Smith, Jefferson Community Center Coordinator  
Randy Robinson, Project Manager  
Carolyn Law, Pro Parks Art Planner  
Larry Glaser, Jefferson Golf Course Manager  
Raft Hollingworth, Parks Athletic Field Coordinator  
JB Dennison, John Williamson, Washington DOE  
Greg Brower, Andy Mitton, The Berger Partnership  
Pat Barlow, PACE Engineering  
Elizabeth Conner, Artist  
Paul Gerhart, Jefferson Park Alliance, North Beacon Hill Council
- Meeting Facilitator:** Cheryl Fraser, Parks South Resource Manager  
**Welcome:** The PAT sign-in sheet was circulated and signed.
- Role of PAT:** The overall role of the PAT, as directed by Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds, is to discuss the new park development plans and prioritize the elements. The goal of tonight's meeting is to get consensus on a Preferred Alternative Plan for Schematic Design
- Guest Comments:** John Williamson, WDOE stated the need of the Dept. of Ecology to find a temporary (during reservoir construction) and permanent location for their air quality monitoring station that now sits on top of the reservoir berm on the west side of the south reservoir.
- Previous Meeting Notes:** Meeting summary from 10/20/05 was approved with no corrections by PAT members.
- Project Progress Report:** Randy R. gave an update on the Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) reservoir project and their schedule.  
The Jefferson Park Expansion project schedule was quickly reviewed with the following key dates mentioned: , Parks Provview – late November, the Seattle Design Commission – early December, next Public meeting –12/15/05. Schematic Design should be largely complete by the end of December, then we will move on to Design Development. Next PAT meeting is January 19, 2006. All PAT members were encouraged to attend the public meeting in December to show support for the Schematic Design and hear what other citizens have to say.

## Analysis:

Andy Mitton described the pedestrian access points into the park and circulation routes around the park, parking, traffic volumes, topography, fencing/barriers and other aspects of the site as it affects the design.

## Schematic Design Presentation:

First Greg Brower gave an overview of the design implications of the SPU reservoir project such as the above ground structure, fencing, etc. Then he outlined the aspects of the Jefferson Park Site Plan from 2002 and related the assumptions that were made in 2002 with our current understanding of the site constraints now.

Greg then summarized the “vision” statements for Jefferson park that were discussed at last month’s PAT meeting. Those visions included: Location, Views, Diversity, Sports, Community Involvement, Inviting, Logical Flow, Beauty, Families, Future Generations, Open Spaces.

Next, Greg presented four different schematic sketches of the park that included a variety of options for circulation, grading, location of the play area, configuration of plaza, etc. These four plans were slightly different but had a lot of similarities too – these sketches were primarily just to get the conversation going.

The main plans for discussion tonight were Schematic Plan 1 and Schematic Plan 2 which were presented by Greg.

**Plan 1** showed extensive grading and filling of the north reservoir with an open side to the west and gentle grades to the east. This plan included a natural water feature, a plaza with organic qualities, and some key viewpoints. The play area is in the current location of the tennis courts. The main promenade was a circular route and the western plateau was mostly sloping.

**Plan 2** had less grading that left portions of the berm in place with a “valley” in the middle of the north reservoir in the NE-SW direction. This plan showed the play area in the NE corner by the fire station. The plaza and water feature were architectural in character. The main promenade was linear from NE to SW.

Both plans showed the baseball field orientation in the SW of the south reservoir (sports plateau) with an adjacent soccer field. Both plans showed the SPU gate house being turned into a comfort station (restroom).

## Schematic Design Discussion:

**Steve** asked how much fill was in the two plans and what kind of vegetation was being conceived?

**Greg** responded that Plan 1 had more fill than Plan 2 (in case we weren’t able to get the fill soil that we needed. Plants would include a lot of trees, but not over the reservoir; shrubs and groundcover on steep slopes and specific highly ornamental areas.

**Monique** asked if the Sound Transit dirt could be used?

**Greg** said that that had been considered but that timing was wrong.

**Mike** said that the site was quiet now – but that would change. What about the NW corner? Would that be a pleasant place to be?

**Mira** said that being above the traffic in the NW corner would be good.

**Greg** stressed that a diversity of viewpoints was what the design was after - some views would be quiet and composed and some busier.

**Paul** Gerhart said he thought the park plans looked like primarily sports field parks – he preferred more passive/natural parks. He asked if the design had considered permeable surfaces and wondered about textures and finishes. He is always looking for quiet places and cautions that noise from sports fields (whistles etc)

**Greg** responded that the north meadow is still all passive with only an occasional practice use little kids. Mike doubted that the north meadow would get much soccer use if the main field was synthetic surfaced.

**Mira** commented that the circulation promenade as a good idea but that the diagonal promenade made an important connection to the path around the Nine Hole Golf Course. She also thought that the strong concept of a water feature and reflection pools was getting lost. Feels the historical link to the reservoirs is getting lost.

**Greg** asked Mira if the water feature was always envisioned to be storm water?

**Mira** mentioned that a standing body of water (reflecting pool) was always envisioned when she was on the PAT that developed the 2002 Plan.

Mike mentioned that a stormwater feature could be a trade for a recirculating system. A lined detention pond is a possibility.

Steve added that a recirculating system is not sustainable and that it would require a lot of maintenance.

**Monique** liked that loop pathway and where paths gave people choices. She asked: where are the views?

**Greg** responded that there are main views (plaza, lawn bowling area, and NW berm) and lesser views from the western edge and other spots.

**Monique** mentioned that the Pancake Breakfast a couple of Saturdays ago had a lot of people from the neighborhood that came out with strong affinity for the views in the park. She also thought that the steep grades could be used as an activity like a climbing wall, skateboard park, etc. that would draw people to the west side of the park.

**Randy Smith** commented that the water feature could be series of detention ponds (reflective, maybe). Consider weirs and creative ways to hold water. Could also be dry water beds. Loop trails are good. But the location of the play area in Plan 1 is in the way of future community center expansion.

There was much discussion about the possibility of and timing of, a community center expansion. **Cheryl** said that there was no funding and no time frame for a new community center at Jefferson. **Randy** said to leave the tennis courts as is and move the play area elsewhere.

**Stuart** is not in favor of tennis courts being expanded to the north towards the fire station – that would tend to block more of the park openness resulting in less access for pedestrians. Leave the existing tennis courts where they are now and consider widening out to 3 deep. Put the play area close to the fire station. He likes Option Plan 2 with less fill – just push the existing dirt around, use less fill and use money for more important things. Keep existing trees as much as possible. Loop circulation is good. Terrace the west side of the park with more vegetation on the west side, more naturalistic. Basketball court should be oriented north-south, never east-west. Orientation of baseball field is better in these options.

**Mira** thought that the programming requirements of the play area required that it be close to the community center. Grading on the west would have to take into consideration the buried electrical conduit.

**Greg** mentioned that the fill would be from 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue (dirt road) westward. We can work within the constraints of City Light.

**Mike** said that the play area should be BIG. Jefferson Advisory Council does not want the current play area to be out of commission during construction. 2 synthetic soccer fields is very good; not needed but will be

good if we can make it work. Water feature should be full scale if we are to do it at all (he is not committed to the storm water ideas being presented). From an engineering standpoint, the detention idea may not work. Consider features that create pools when it rains, but dry in the summer months when water is most likely desired. We have a view of Puget Sound, the largest water feature in the region. Dry creek bed is not safe.

**Steve** likes the play area north of the tennis courts and he likes the loop circulation. Less fill soil is good, will let us concentrate funds on amenities. Likes the more natural water feature over the architectural one.

**Larry Glaser** asked about additional parking?

**Randy Robinson** responded that a lot of creative ideas about parking were discussed at the last PAT meeting including using the VA Hospital lot and the Parks Horticulture facility lot.

There was a lengthy discussion about irrigation types, duration, etc. **Randy** responded that there would be more on irrigation in Design Development.

**Department of Ecology  
facility siting:**

Greg described the siting options for the DOE facility – both temporary and permanent. The optimal temporary location would be west of the driving range, north of lawn bowling. The optimal permanent location would be southwest of the completed buried reservoir down hill from the proposed new baseball field.

**Art Plan**

Carolyn Law briefly described the intention of art for Jefferson park as being “a unique layer of the place that Jefferson Park can be”.

Elizabeth Conner said that her direction for art on this project was to focus on the north reservoir and berm. She wants to work with concepts about land and water – filling and draining, draining and filling. She related the reservoirs to being big “sandbox”.

**Conclusion:**

Randy summarized the agreed upon elements of the two option plans that would carry on to the Preferred Schematic Plan as being:

1. Circular path concept.
2. Naturalistic features.
3. Water (storm water only), maybe reflective.
4. Limit the fill quantities and earthwork – less is better.

**Next meeting:**

The next public meeting is December 15, 2005 and the next PAT meeting is January 19th, 2006 at 6:30 PM at the Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse.

**Meeting Summary By:**

rfr

**Additional Information is Available:**

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/JeffersonPark.htm>
- Randy Robinson, Seattle Parks Project Manager, (206) 684-7035; [randy.robinson@seattle.gov](mailto:randy.robinson@seattle.gov)
- Cheryl Fraser, Parks Resources Manager, (206) 684-8016; [cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov](mailto:cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov)